

Ex Parte Reexamination Interview Summary

Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
09/553,395	REISMAN, RICHARD	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tammara R Peyton	2182	

All participants (USPTO personnel, patent owner, patent owner's representative): *X M*

(1) Tammara R Peyton

(3) Bruce Bernstein, Reg. No. 34,550

(2) Jeff Gaffin, Tanh Q Nguyen

(4) Robert Westerlund, Reg. No. 31,439

Date of Interview: Jan. 22 and 23 2003

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal (copy given to: 1) patent owner 2) patent owner's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Any other agreement(s) are set forth below under "Description of the general nature of what was agreed to..."

Claim(s) discussed: 29, 40, 59, 78.

Identification of prior art discussed: Pettus, US 6,031,977 and Crawford, US 5,771,354.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:
See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims patentable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims patentable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 2281). IF A RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION HAS ALREADY BEEN FILED, THEN PATENT OWNER IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO PROVIDE THE MANDATORY STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (37 CFR 1.560(b)). THE REQUIREMENT FOR PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT CAN NOT BE WAIVED. EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).

cc: Requester (if third party requester)

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner and Applicant's representatives discussed the wording in the independent claims 29, 40, 59, and 78. Specifically, the claim language "effect transport of the selected content publishers to the user station over a communications network" and "effect presentation of the stored content to the user at the user station with a user interface that is customized to the respective service." Examiner read the claim as meaning that the "selected content" was from only one "publisher[s]" as taught by Pettus. Applicant's representatives offered to clean up the claim language to distinguish the invention over the prior art of Pettus. Examiner and Applicant's representatives agreed to the claim language of "effect transport of the selected content from each of the plurality of [publishers] services." Examiner will perform another search and reconsider the Office's position.